

**REMARKS**

***Status of the Claims***

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-29 remain pending in the application. Of these, claims 1, 10 and 20 are independent. Claims 1-6, 10-15 and 20-25 are sought to be amended. Applicant believes that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103***

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,914 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Harrison"). Claims 2-6, 11-15 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Harrison in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,914 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Blackketter"). Claims 9, 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Harrison in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2005/0028208 A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Ellis").

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that Harrison cannot be used as prior art against the claims of the instant claimed invention because subject matter which was prior art under former 35 U.S.C. 103 via 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is now disqualified as prior art against the claimed invention if that subject matter and the claimed invention "were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." (*see*, 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and MPEP 706.02(k))

Applicant submits that at the time the invention was made in the instant application and in Harrison that both inventions were subject to an obligation of assignment to Intel Corporation. Accordingly, Harrison cannot be used to reject the claims of this application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with regard to claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27 and 29 since Harrison does not teach each element of independent claims 1, 10 and 20 for at least the following reason. Claims 1, 10 and 20 have been amended to include providing the enhanced content data stored in the personal web server to a client device via a personal web page hosted by the personal web server, comprising: loading the personal web page on the client device, wherein a synchronization client is created as an object window in the personal web page on the client device; and updating the object window via the synchronization client when enhanced content data is received from a synchronization server in the first computer. Support for this may be found in the specification on page 9, lines 18-31; figure 4 and original claim 2. The Examiner acknowledges that Harrison fails to disclose an object in the synchronized web page. Applicant asserts that Harrison does not teach or suggest at least the added feature noted above. Applicant also asserts that Harrison, Blackketter and Ellis, either taken alone or in combination, do teach or suggest this added feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 10 and 20 (and their dependent claims 2-9, 11-19 and 21-29) are patentable over Harrison, Blackketter and Ellis, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**ESTABLISHING COMMON OWNERSHIP**

I, Molly A. McCall with Registration No. 46,126, state that the instant application 09/870,100 and Harrison (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,914 B1) were both subject to an obligation of assignment to Intel Corporation at the time the inventions were made.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: June 16, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/ Reg. No. 46,126

Molly A. McCall

(703) 633-3311

P9902 reply to final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: 6/16/2006

Signature

*Julie Dussault*  
Julie Dussault

6/16/2006  
Date